

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-7, 11-13, 16-20 and 25-31 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 14 and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 32-35 have been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Dao for the courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative, Ryan McCarthy, during the telephonic interview on April 30, 2009. During the interview, Mr. McCarthy and Examiner Dao discussed specific claim amendments, which define each of the independent claims over the currently asserted references, and put the independent claims in condition for allowance in view of the currently asserted references. Each of the independent claims has been amended based on the amendments discussed during the Examiner Interview. An indication of allowance for all claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a computer-readable medium, which may include communication medium. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claims 2, 3, 9 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Consequently, the rejection of claims 2, 3, 9 and 10 has been rendered moot.

Each of claims 1, 4-7, 11, 12, 27 and 28 has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion to be directed to machine-readable storage device. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAML in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,701,518 to Dwyer et al. (“Dwyer”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claims 3 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Consequently, the rejection of claims 3 and 9 has been rendered moot.

Each of claims 1, 13, 17 and 25 has been amended to include the features of an assertion statement that tests whether a specified condition is true, and a breakpoint that halts execution of the computer program, the assertion statement including an argument to activate logging with programmer-controlled granularity, the argument being used to determine whether to update a log entry when the assertion statement fails, each checkpoint group including a respective identification, selectively activating at least one checkpoint group based on the respective identification, indicating the activation variant of the plurality of activation variants, in accordance with the at least one checkpoint group is to behave, and executing the computer program based on selectively activating the at least one checkpoint group and indicating the activation variant, wherein only the at least one checkpoint group of the computer program is executed, and a remainder of the plurality of checkpoint groups, if any, is not executed.

As discussed during the Examiner Interview, each of claims 1, 13, 17 and 25, as amended, define over the asserted references. More specifically, and as discussed in Applicants' previous response, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference in its entirety, SAML provides an XML-based standard for exchanging security information (e.g., authentication and authorization data) between security domains (i.e., between an identity provider and a service provider), and the SAML assertions are each provided as a unique response to a SAML query. Consequently, the SAML assertions do not test whether a specified condition is true, and do not include either a breakpoint that halts execution of a computer program, or an argument to activate logging with programmer-controlled granularity, much less an argument that is used to determine whether to update a log entry when the assertion statement fails.

Dwyer does not cure the deficient disclosure of SAML. More specifically, Dwyer is directed to systems and methods for enabling efficient processing of a program that includes assertion instructions. Dwyer provides a compiler 110 that is configured to compile a program

46 into a compiled program 115 such that, whether assertion testing is to be performed can be controlled before running the program 115 (see col. 5, ll. 55-58). The compiler 110 is configured to insert mode selection instructions into the program 115, to selectively run the program in one of three modes. In a first mode, the assertion testing is turned on such that assertion testing is performed despite the adverse effect on performance. In a second mode, the assertion testing is turned off such that the program runs even if an error is encountered, and in a third mode, the assertion testing is only performed to the extent that performance is not adversely effected (see col. 5, l. 64-col. 6, l. 16). Dwyer fails to disclose the above-identified features of each of claims 1, 13, 17 and 25.

Each of claims 11 and 26 ultimately depends from one of claims 1 and 25, which define over the asserted reference as discussed in detail above. Consequently, each of claims 11 and 26 also defines over the asserted reference for at least the same reasons. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 24 and 27-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAML in view of Dwyer and Bates (U.S. Pat. No. 6,378,125). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of claims 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 24, and 27-31 ultimately depends from one of claims 1, 13, 17 and 25, which define over the asserted reference as discussed in detail above. Consequently, each of claims 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 24, and 27-31 also defines over the asserted reference for at least the same reasons. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Other Claim Amendments

New claims 32-35 have been added and include features that have been cancelled from each of claims 1, 13, 17 and 25, respectively. Each of claims 32-25 ultimately depends from one of claims 1, 13, 17 and 25, which define over the asserted reference as discussed in detail above. Consequently, each of claims 32-35 also defines over the asserted reference for at least the same reasons. Therefore, favorable consideration and allowance of claims 32-35 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reason for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to amendment. Applicants respectfully request consideration of all filed IDS' not previously considered, by initialing and returning each Form 1449.

No charges are believed due. However, if any fees are due, they are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply all charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 13913-0083001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 6, 2009



Ryan McCarthy
Reg. No. 50,636

Customer No. 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (512) 472-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945